

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 476

UD 028 230

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission for Desegregation
Implementation Monitoring Project CANAL. Third
Quarter Progress Report of Year 2 (March 1 to May 31,
1990).
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Jul 90
NOTE 75p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see
UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) --
Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Budgets; Community Control; Compliance (Legal);
Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education;
*Management Development; *Participant
Characteristics; *Participative Decision Making;
Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *School
Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

This evaluation analyzes participation of the core planning teams in the special training activities of Project Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL), part of a court-mandated desegregation plan in Chicago (Illinois). The report covers activities during the third quarter of CANAL's second year. CANAL's goal is to organize and train core planning teams to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the community in the organizational and educational processes of the schools. The following findings are presented: (1) sessions for chairpersons of high school departments and for school-based evaluators, team chairpersons, and process observers were not well-attended; (2) sessions for parent liaisons, students, and special groups were even less well attended; (3) the Instructional Strategies Fair fell short of expected attendance; (4) the thematic seminars were so poorly attended that their continuation cannot be justified; and (5) the two meetings of the CANAL Advisory Council were attended by only a few of its members. Statistical data are presented in 14 tables. The following materials are appended: (1) a description of the monitoring commission staff; (2) a chronological list of training activities; (3) a budget; (4) a school board resolution regarding Project CANAL; and (5) a report on a public hearing on Project CANAL. (FMW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

4D

ED336476

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL

THIRD QUARTER PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2 (March 1 to May 31, 1990)

July 1990

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Donn F. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Ted D. Kimbrough
General Superintendent of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LeBron - Osilija
Monitoring Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

00025230

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate	Jesse Miller
Maxine Duster	Uthman Muhammad
Mari Fohrman	Donnell Peterson
Carlos Heredia	George Riddick
Gwendolyn Laroche	Aida Sanchez
Henry Martinez	Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION STAFF

Barbara Anglin
Helen Jackson
Barb Leebens-Osilaja
Christy Spears
Ana Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

1819 West Pershing Road

6th Floor East

Chicago, Illinois 60609

(312) 890-8220

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL

**THIRD QUARTER
PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2
(March 1 to May 31, 1990)**

*Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Norman R. Kurtz, Primary Consultant*

July 1990

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator,
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Background and Purpose	4
Principals	5
High School Department Chairpersons	8
School-based Evaluators, CPT Chairpersons, and Process Observers	8
Advisory Council Members	15
Engineers and Food Services Managers	15
Parent Liaison Workshops	18
Student Workshops	21
Instructional Strategies Fair	23
Assertive Discipline Seminar	28
Thematic Models	28
Summary	31

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Monitoring Commission Staff	37
Appendix B: Project CANAL Training Activities at the Oakenwald Center (March 1, 1990 Through June 22, 1990)	39
Appendix C: Budget Status	43
Appendix D: Board Resolution on Project CANAL	46
Appendix E: Public Hearing on Project CANAL	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 -	Principals Attending Training Meetings for Principals 41 CANAL Schools December 6 and 7, 1989 and January 11, 1990	6
Table 2 -	Training for 41 CANAL Schools High School Department Chairpersons' Meeting January 10, 1990	9
Table 3 -	Training for 41 CANAL Schools Workshop for School-based Evaluators/CPT Chairpersons/Process Observers December 8, 1989	11
Table 4 -	Training for 41 CANAL Schools Workshops for School-based Evaluators/CPT Chairpersons/Process Observers January 12 and February 9, 1990	13
Table 5 -	Training for 41 CANAL Schools Workshops for School-based Evaluators/CPT Chairpersons/Process Observers January 12 and February 9, 1990	16
Table 6 -	CANAL Advisory Council Meetings January 18 and February 28, 1990	17
Table 7 -	Training for 41 CANAL Schools Engineers and Food Services Managers February 15, 1990	19
Table 8 -	Training for 41 CANAL Schools Parent Liaison Workshop December 19, 1989, and January 16 and February 13, 1990	22
Table 9 -	CANAL Training Student Workshop: 41 CANAL Schools December 20, 1989, and February 21, 1990	24
Table 10 -	Training for 41 CANAL Schools Instructional Strategies Fair January 31, 1990	26

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table 11 - Training for 41 CANAL Schools Assertive Discipline Seminar February 2, 1990	29
Table 12 - Training for 41 CANAL Schools Ron Edmonds Symposium December 7, 1989, and December 21, 1989	30
Table 13 - Training for 41 CANAL Schools Paideia Seminar December 6, 1989	32
Table 14 - Training for 41 CANAL Schools Paideia Seminar January 10, 1990	33

INTRODUCTION

During this third quarter, beginning March 1, 1990, the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation has continued to monitor Project CANAL Training Center events. There have been no apparent changes in the foci of training activities. The training activities reported on here are for the period December 1, 1989, through February 28, 1990. The Commission has received no evidence of modification or improvement in the implementation of Project CANAL.

The Commission continues to be concerned that, as in Year 1, the Core Planning Team (CPT) members attending training sessions have never reflected the formal composition originally defined in the CANAL proposal. Thus, training activities, which consume most of the CANAL resources, are not reaching the intended audiences. Problems of implementation have not improved: they have worsened. In addition, Project CANAL has not implemented a plan adequate to continue to make clear that the state-mandated Local School Councils (LSCs) -- not the CPTs -- are the legally mandated site-based governance teams.

A listing of all training activities occurring March 1, 1990, through June 22, 1990, monitored is in Appendix B. The Commission's analyses of reports received and its own observational data will be corrected on a later report. Second year budget information as of June 30, 1990, is in Appendix C. The Commission also analyzed the CANAL School Improvement Plan Interim Progress Reports. (The Commission did not receive a report for Gale Academy.) The content of each Interim report was analyzed to determine whether or not the schools used the reporting form and process requested by CANAL staff. We also assessed the utility of the Interim report as a management tool. (1) A majority of the

schools attempted to use the report form; (2) only one report (Bradwell School) was submitted under the signature of a CPT; and (3) most reports provided only limited information and are of minimum value for management purposes.

This quarterly report also includes a copy of Board Resolution 90-0321-MS4 adopted March 21, 1990, which the Commission supported (see Appendix D). In addition, the minutes of a Public Hearing on Project CANAL conducted by the Blue Ribbon Task Force on March 9, 1990, is attached in Appendix E.

Most analyses in this quarterly report concentrate on a series of meetings organized to train special groups or to focus on special topics. The training was to emphasize such matters as assertive discipline or thematic models; specific groups were to include engineers, students, parents, and advisory council members. There was a marked failure of participation in Project CANAL training sessions. This report documents:

- Training for principals was not universally successful.
- Fourteen of 36 principals failed to attend a session specially designed for elementary school principals.
- Thirteen of 41 principals failed to participate in training for elementary and high school principals.
- Principals from six elementary schools failed to attend any of the special sessions designed for them.
- Nineteen of the 41 principals attended all sessions prepared for them.

- Sessions for school-based evaluators, CPT chairpersons, and process observers were only marginally successful. Sixteen of the 41 schools lacked representatives from any of the three categories.
- In total, only 37 percent of the members of the three groups who had been expected to participate in the training did so.
- Only five engineers and food service managers who were CPT members attended a special session planned for representatives of these categories. Eighty-two should have been present. The poor attendance was reported to be due to snow, but no makeup session was held.
- Parents from the great majority of the 41 CANAL schools did not attend the three parent liaison workshops.
- A total of only seven parents, from two of the 41 CANAL schools, attended the first workshop.
- Five parents, from two of the 41 CANAL schools, constituted the total attendance at the second workshop. None of the parents was a member of a CPT; four of the five were from one school.
- In a third session, eight parents, from five of the 41 CANAL schools, attended. Seventy other persons attended as well, representing six of the 41 schools; 47 of them were teachers and the remainder were either ancillaries or other individuals who were not members of a CPT.

The findings are discussed in greater detail in the sections that follow.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Project CANAL -- Creating a New Approach to Learning -- is implementing a school-based management system to involve all the constituencies of the school community, the students, parents, teachers, administrators, and others. The management model tries to get each constituency to share its special perspective with the others in the process of deciding how to improve academic achievement. Organizationally, the concept rests on a Core Planning Team (CPT) which, at each school, is to include the principal, teachers, a minimum of three ancillary staff, a minimum of five parents, no less than two community members, and, in the case of high schools, students.

The Monitoring Commission has documented the problems Project CANAL has encountered in creating CPTs, resulting in teams which do not include parents and community members. Training sessions which were offered to prepare CPT members to implement the shared decision-making model often failed to reach them because parents, ancillary school staff, and community members frequently did not attend. Thus the training supported by the Settlement Funds -- a substantial part of CANAL's resources -- was often ineffective due to poor attendance.

Previous Monitoring Commission reports have documented training efforts directed at entire school staffs. This report evaluates participation in training designed for special subgroups of the CPTs and focused on special topics. The training activities considered here took place from December 1, 1989, through February 28, 1990, the second quarter of Year 2 of Project CANAL. They included training for principals, teachers who are chairpersons of high school departments, school-based evaluators, CPT chairpersons, process observers,

the CANAL Advisory Council members, school engineers and food services managers, parents, and students. They also included an instructional strategies fair, assertive discipline seminars, Paideia Seminars, and a Ron Edmonds Symposium.

PRINCIPALS

The three training sessions for principals focused on "conflict resolution, documentation of local site activities and budgeting issues."¹ The first session (December 6, 1989) was for high school principals only. A session the following day was for elementary schools principals. The third session (January 11, 1990) included both elementary and high school principals. The total numbers of principals present and absent for each of the three sessions are given at the bottom of Table 1. Thus, only one of five principals was absent from the session for high school principals, but 14 out of 36 of the elementary principals missed the session exclusively for them as did 13 of 36 who were to have attended the session for both elementary and high school principals. In other words, more than a third of the principals, excepting those of high schools, failed to attend the training sessions. The principal of DuSable High School missed both sessions. Principals of six elementary schools -- Byford, Cooper, Dyett, Gale, Hammond and Mayo -- failed to appear for both of their sessions. Still, about half of all principals attended all of the sessions prepared for them.

¹ Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, CANAL Quarterly Progress Report, February 28, 1990, Chicago Public Schools, p. 2.

TABLE 1

Principals Attending Training Meetings for Principals
41 CANAL Schools

December 6, and 7, 1989, and January 11, 1990

Schools	December 6, 1989 High Schools	December 7, 1989 Elementary Schools	January 11, 1990 High and Elementary Schools
Bass		X	X
Bennett			X
Bradwell		X	
Byford			
Carter		X	X
Clark			X
Cooper			
DePriest		X	X
Dett		X	X
DuBois		X	X
Dumas		X	
DuSable*			
Dyett			
Fernwood		X	X
Frazier		X	X
Gale			
Goldblatt			X
Gregory		X	X
Guggenheim		X	X
Hammond			
Hearst		X	X
Howe		X	X
Hughes			X
Jungman			X
Kelvyn Park*	X		X

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Principals Attending Meetings for Principals
41 CANAL Schools

December 6, and 7, 1989, and January 11, 1990

Schools	December 6, 1989 High Schools	December 7, 1989 Elementary Schools	January 11, 1990 High and Elementary Schools
Lafayette			X
Lowell		X	X
Manierre			X
Mayo			
Moos		X	
Orr*	X		X
Piccolo		X	
Robeson*	X		X
Sherman		X	X
Spencer		X	
Stowe			X
Sumner		X	
Terrell		X	X
Westinghouse	X		X
Williams		X	X
Woodson	—	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Total Attending	4	22	28
Total Absent	1	19	13

^aCANAL schools include five high schools and 36 elementary schools. The high schools are indicated by an asterisk (*) in the table column to the left.

HIGH SCHOOL DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

A special training session for teachers who chair various departments in high schools included: "topics in critical thinking, reading strategies across the content areas, and proposal writing resources."² Fifty-three attended (see Table 2). The total number of departments in the six high schools has not been provided, so the attendance can not be related to that number. Table 2 does reveal considerable variation: more than a dozen chairpersons from Kelvyn Park, Orr, and Westinghouse attended; only five were there from DuSable and Robeson.

SCHOOL-BASED EVALUATORS, CPT CHAIRPERSONS, AND PROCESS OBSERVERS

As part of the CANAL design, each school was to appoint a school-based evaluator to provide the CPT with analyses needed for planning and decision-making. Each school also was to have a CPT chairperson and a process observer, the latter to monitor the shared governance and decision-making.

Three training sessions brought the members of the groups together. The December 8 meeting "was held to address the individual roles of the chairpersons, school-based evaluators, and process observers on the Core Planning Team. Two additional sessions, on January 12 and February 9, were held to address their combined roles on the Core Planning Team."³ The attendance sheets for the first session on December 8 did not differentiate

² Ibid., p. 2.

³ Ibid., p. 11.

TABLE 2

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
High School Department Chairperson's Meeting

January 10, 1990

School	CPT	Non-CPT	Total
DuSable	3	3	6
Kelvyn Park	3	11	14
Orr	12	3	15
Robeson	1	4	5
Westinghouse	<u>13</u>	—	<u>13</u>
	32	21	53

the group to which the attendees belonged, so it is not possible to determine whether those attending were chairpersons, evaluators, or process observers. Table 3 displays the schools and the number of attendees by which they were represented. Sixteen schools had no representatives -- Clark, DuBois, DuSable, Dyett, Goldblatt, Guggenheim, Hammond, Lafayette, Manierre, Mayo, Moos, Orr, Robeson, Stowe, Sumner, and Williams.

Every school was supposed to have an evaluator, a CPT chairperson, and a process observer, so the total number of attendees should be 123. Only 37 percent actually attended: for every person who attended, two stayed away. Only six schools had three persons in attendance; nine had two, and ten had only one person at the session.

Attendance sheets for the second and third training sessions, on January 12 and February 9 respectively, identified those attending according to whether they were evaluators, chairpersons, or process observers. Ninety-nine individuals (see column TJ of Table 4) attended on January 12, and 84 (see column TF of Table 4) attended on February 9, a total of 183. If each of the 41 schools had been represented by the expected three persons, 123 persons would have attended each session, a total of 246. Thus, the January session attracted about 80 percent of the participants expected, while that for the February meeting declined to 68 percent. The total of 183 for both sessions is 74 percent of the target group.

Attendance was not uniform for the 41 CANAL schools. The three representatives of each school attended each of the two sessions for only seven schools: DePriest, DuBois, Dyett, Howe, Manierre, Mayo, and Woodson.⁴

⁴In Table 4, Spencer and Stowe, had a total of six; Lowell had seven attending. Those totals resulted from more than one person attending from a particular category. For example, Lowell was represented by an evaluator at both sessions, (continued on Page 15)

TABLE 3

Training for 41 CANAL Schools

Workshop for School-based Evaluators/CPT
Chairpersons/Process Observers

December 8, 1989

School	CPT	Non-CPT	Total
Bass	3		3
Bennett	2		2
Bradwell	1	2	3
Byford	2		2
Carter	1		1
Clark			0
Cooper	2		2
DePriest	2		2
Dett	1		1
DuBois			0
Dumas	3		3
DuSable			0
Dyett			0
Fernwood	1		1
Frazier	2		2
Gale	1		1
Goldblatt			0
Gregory	1		1
Guggenheim			0
Hammond			0
Hearst	1		1
Howe	2		2
Hughes	1		1
Jungman	2		2
Kelvyn Park	1		1
Lafayette			0
Lowell	1		1
Manierre			0
Mayo			0
Moos			0

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Training for 41 CANAL Schools

Workshop for School-based Evaluators/CPT
Chairpersons/Process Observers

December 8, 1989

School	CPT	Non-CPT	Total
Orr			0
Piccolo	2		2
Robeson			0
Sherman	3		3
Spencer	2		2
Stowe			0
Sumner			0
Terrell	3		3
Westinghouse	1		1
Williams			0
Woodson	<u>3</u>	—	<u>3</u>
	44	2	46

25 schools were represented

16 schools were not represented

TABLE 4

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
Workshops for School-based Evaluators/CPT
Chairpersons/Process Observers

January 12 and February 9, 1990

School	Evaluator		Chair		Process Ob		Totals		
	Jan 12	Feb 9	Jan 12	Feb 9	Jan 12	Feb 9	TJ	TF	Total
Bass		1	1	1	1		2	2	4
Bennett	1	1	1	1	1		3	2	5
Bradwell	1	1	1	1	1		3	2	5
Byford	1		1				2		2
Carter	1	1	1	1			2	2	4
Clark	1	1	1		1	1	3	2	5
Cooper					1	1	1	1	2
DePriest	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6
Dett	1		1				2		2
DuBois	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6
Dumas		1	1	1	2		3	2	5
DuSable	1	1					1	1	2
Dyett	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6
Fernwood	1		1	1	1	1	3	2	5
Frazier			1			1	1	1	2
Gale	1	1		1	1	1	2	3	5
Goldblatt		1		1	1		1	2	3
Gregory	1	1	1	1	1		3	2	5
Guggenheim	1	1			1	1	2	2	4
Hammond	1		1	1			2	1	3
Hearst	1	1		1	1	1	2	3	5
Howe	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6
Hughes	1	1	1	1		1	2	3	5
Jungman	1	1	1	1			2	2	4
Kelvyn Park	1	1	1		1		3	1	4

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
Workshops for School-based Evaluators/CPT
Chairpersons/Process Observers

January 12 and February 9, 1990

School	Evaluator		Chair		Process Ob		Totals		
	Jan 12	Feb 9	Jan 12	Feb 9	Jan 12	Feb 9	TJ	TF	Total
Lafayette	1		2	2			3	2	5
Lowell	1	1	2	2	1		4	3	7
Manierre	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6
Mayo	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6
Moos	1	1	1				2	1	3
Orr	1	1	1	1			2	2	4
Piccolo		1	1	1	1	1	2	3	5
Robeson	1		1		1	1	3	1	4
Sherman	1	1	1		1	1	3	2	5
Spencer	1	2	1	1	1		3	3	6
Stowe	1	2	1		1	1	3	3	6
Sumner	1	1				1	1	2	3
Terrell			1		1		2		2
Westinghouse	1	1		1	1	1	2	3	5
Williams	1	1	1	1	1		3	2	5
Woodson	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6
	34	34	35	29	30	21	99	84	183

Other attendees included: January 12-Cooper, principal; Robeson, teacher; February 9-Bradwell, counselor; Cooper, principal; Jungman, unknown; Piccolo, clerk; Robeson, teacher. Under totals TJ=total attendees on January 12 while TF=total attendees on February 9.

Table 5 highlights the absences. Seven schools out of 41 were not represented by a school-based evaluator on January 12; on February 9, nine had no such representative. Chairpersons from eight of the 41 did not attend on January 12; the number for February 9 was 13. The attendance of process observers was least adequate: 12 were absent on January 12 and 20 failed to attend on February 9. In Table 4 it may be seen that school-based evaluators for three schools missed both sessions, as did chairpersons for four schools and process observers for ten.

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Two training sessions were held to review activities for the 25 community leaders who make up the CANAL Advisory Council. Only a small number of the members attended meetings, six on January 18 and seven on February 28 (see Table 6).

Three of the eight principals on the Council attended in January; in February, only one attended. The two district superintendents and the one assistant superintendent missed both meetings.

ENGINEERS AND FOOD SERVICES MANAGERS

A training session was held for school engineers and food services managers to discuss "the role of the engineer and food services manager as related to the school-based

(Continued from Page 10) and two co-chairpersons attended each of the two sessions; a process observer was present only at the January workshop.

TABLE 5

Workshops for School-based Evaluators/CPT
Chairpersons/Process Observers

January 12 and February 9, 1990

Date	<u>Evaluators</u>		<u>CPT Chairperson</u>		<u>Process Observers</u>	
	Present	Absent	Present	Absent	Present	Absent
January 12	34	7	33	8	29	12
February 9	32	9	28	13	21	20

The table shows the number of schools that were represented by an evaluator, their CPT chairperson and process observer. Table 9 indicates that some schools had more than one representative from a category, thus, Lafayette has two co-chairpersons of their CPT and both attended on January 12 and February 9. The numbers in this table show only the number of schools represented by any of the three groups of attendees.

TABLE 6

CANAL Advisory Council Meetings

January 18 and February 28, 1990

January 18 Attendees	
DePriest (principal)	1
Dyett (principal)	1
DuSable (principal)	1
CTU Financial Secretary*	1
Citizens School Committee	1
Parent Community Council	<u>1</u>
	6
February 28 Attendees	
Carter (principal)	1
Community Members	2
CTU Financial Secretary*	1
Parent Representative	1
Parent Community Council	1
University Representative	<u>1</u>
	7

*CTU = Chicago Teachers Union.

On January 18 one non-Advisory Council member signed the attendance roll and on February 28 two non-members signed. They are not included here.

management process and to the implementation of the School Improvement Plan."⁵ It was also to address "training experiences specifically designed to enhance the participation of non-teaching staff in the process of school planning and governance."⁶ The goals of the training are appropriate, but their attainment has been limited by the lack of participation by food services managers in CANAL training, as documented in prior Monitoring Commission reports. Lack of participation continued in the special session of February 15. Only six engineers and food services managers, from five of the 41 CANAL schools, attended (see Table 7). If each of the 41 schools had sent the expected two individuals, 82 would have attended. CANAL reported that the meager attendance was due to snowfall,⁷ but no makeup session was offered during this period of time. General sharing of experiences of course cannot take place with such sparse attendance which, additionally may have had a negative impact on the few engineers and food services managers who did attend.

PARENT LIAISON WORKSHOPS

Parent liaisons are "responsible for encouraging and increasing parent participation in school activities, motivating parents to actively participate in training activities at the Training Center that enable them to develop skills and techniques in school-based

⁵Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs' CANAL Quarterly Progress Report, February 28, 1990, Chicago Public Schools, p. 14.

⁶Ibid., p. 14.

⁷Ibid., p. 14.

TABLE 7

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
Engineers and Food Service Managers

February 15, 1990

School	Engineers	Food Services	Non-CPT	Total
DePriest	1			1
DuBois	1			1
Fernwood		1		1
Lafayette	1	1		2
Terrell	—	—	1	1
	3	2	1	6

management, and serving as a liaison between the local school, parent organizations, and Project CANAL staff."⁸

Three workshops were held for them on December 19, January 16, and February 13. The first two sessions were scheduled for two hours in the morning, and the third was a full day of training. (We do not know how many parent liaisons each of the 41 schools had, so we cannot present the percentage attending, by school.) The participation certainly was short of that anticipated by the model for school-based management and decision-making. The numbers reveal how uninvolved parents really are in Project CANAL processes (see Table 8).

Only two schools --Carter and Fernwood -- had representatives at the December 19 session, five from Carter and two from Fernwood. Both the attendees from Fernwood were CPT members. Three of those from Carter were CPT members; one was an ancillary staff member from the school, and another was a non-CPT parent. Project CANAL reported: "As a result of this activity, parents were able to develop their own strategies for expanding resources available to their schools."⁹ It is difficult to take seriously such a statement when only five of 195 parents on CPTs attended and only two out of 41 schools were represented at the training.

Attendance at the January 16 session was even worse: not a single parent from any of the 41 CPTs attended. The only participants were five non-CPT individuals from two schools. Such a sparse session makes poor use of Settlement Fund resources. The apparent

⁸Ibid, p. 12.

⁹Ibid., p. 12.

lack of parental interest seems to confirm a belief that Project CANAL has failed to incorporate parents in the shared decision-making and school-based management processes.

The February 13 all-day session involved a much larger audience: 70 CPT members (accompanied by eight non-CPT persons) represented six CANAL schools. However, most attendees were not there as parent representatives. Indeed, only eight attendees were CPT parents and two were non-CPT parents. They represented only five schools (See Table 8). Most attendees (47) were teachers from six schools; one was a principal, ten were ancillary staff, five were community members, and eight were non-CPT attendees. CANAL described the session as providing "participants with a description of standardized tests that the Chicago Board of Education utilizes for monitoring student academic achievement..., provided suggestions and activities for parents on techniques for preparing their children to perform well on tests."¹⁰ It does not state that only a small number of parents were present to benefit from such material.

The attendance at the parent liaison workshops is a clear signal that CANAL has failed to involve parents. Halfway through its second year, the Project staff has not been able to create a broad-based constituency to lead CANAL schools toward academic achievement. The key constituency for the CANAL concept -- parents -- is not participating.

STUDENT WORKSHOPS

Workshops for students in the 41 CANAL schools were held on December 20 and February 21 to provide them with "skills necessary to participate in the school-based

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 12-13.

TABLE 8

Training for 41 CANAL Schools

December 19, 1989, January 16 and February 13, 1990

School	Constituency						Totals		Totals
	P	T	A	PAR	CM	Non-CPT	CPT	NCPT	Both
<u>December 19, 1989 (2 Hours)</u>									
Carter			1	3		1	4	1	5
Fernwood				2			2		2
Subtotal	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{5}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{6}$	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{7}$
<u>January 16, 1990 (2 Hours)</u>									
Carter						4		4	4
Goldblatt						1		1	1
Subtotal	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{5}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{5}$	$\overline{5}$
<u>February 13, 1990 (All Day)</u>									
Bradwell		4	4	2	3	3	13	3	16
Byford		8	1	2	1	1	12	1	13
Dett		5		1			6		6
DuBois	1	11	2	2		2	16	2	18
Goldblatt		8				2	8	2	10
Sherman		11	2	1	1		15	0	15
Subtotal	$\overline{1}$	$\overline{47}$	$\overline{9}$	$\overline{8}$	$\overline{5}$	$\overline{8}$	$\overline{70}$	$\overline{8}$	$\overline{78}$
Totals	1	47	10	13	5	14	76	14	90

*P=principal; T=teacher; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member; Non-CPT= attendees not on the CPT and not identified in terms of constituency; The CPT totals include the total CPT members attending; the NCPT totals include the total non-CPT persons attending; and, Both is the sum of the CPT and NCPT totals.

management process and to foster their ongoing participation in school improvement initiatives.¹¹ On December 20, 54 students represented 25 schools; on February 21, 28 schools sent 70 students for training. Most schools sent two or three students each, with some sending only one up to a maximum of seven. Sixteen schools were not represented at the first session, 13 at the second, and nine failed to send students either date. However, five of the nine schools with no representation were K-5 schools which do not routinely send students to CANAL training (see Table 9).

High schools, which ought to be the most active through student participation, were not. One, Robeson High School, had no representatives in the first session; DuSable had none in the second. Of the four high schools with attendees in the first session, one sent two students and the other three schools, only one each. At the second session, three of the four high schools represented sent two students each; the other school sent one student.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES FAIR

An Instructional Strategies Fair was held on January 31, described as "a mini conference, entitled, 'Expanding Our Vision,'...held at the Project CANAL Training Center for Local School Council chairpersons and Core Planning Team representatives of participating schools."¹² Those attending were "six members from each team (the principal, one career service representative, one parent, one teacher, one student, and one community

¹¹Ibid., p. 13.

¹²Ibid., p. 8.

TABLE 9

* CANAL Training-Student Workshop: 41 CANAL Schools

December 20, 1989, and February 21, 1990

December 20, 1989			February 21, 1990		
Schools Attending	Number of Students	Schools Absent	Schools Attending	Number of Students	Schools Absent
Bennett	2	Bass	Bass	2	Byford
Bradwell	3	Byford	Bennett	3	Cooper
Carter	2	Clark	Bradwell	5	DePriest
Dett	2	Cooper	Carter	2	DuSable*
Dumas	3	DePriest	Clark	2	Gale
DuSable*	2	DuBois	Dett	2	Goldblatt
Dyett	2	Goldblatt	DuBois	2	Hearst
Fernwood	6	Hammond	Dumas	7	Hughes
Frazier	5	Hearst	Dyett	2	Jungman
Gale	2	Hungman	Fernwood	7	Lafayette
Gregory	2	Lafayette	Frazier	3	Moos
Guggenheim	2	Moos	Gregory	1	Piccolo
Howe	2	Piccolo	Guggenheim	2	Stowe
Hughes	2	Robeson*	Hammond	2	
Kelvyn Park*	1	Sumner	Howe	2	
Lowell	2	Woodson	Kelvyn Park*	2	
Manierre	2		Lowell	2	
Mayo	1		Manierre	2	
Orr*	1		Mayo	2	
Sherman	1		Orr*	2	
Spencer	2		Robeson*	2	
Stowe	2		Sherman	2	
Terrell	2		Spencer	2	
Westinghouse*	1		Sumner	2	
Williams	2		Terrell	3	
			Westinghouse*	1	
			Williams	2	
			Woodson	<u>2</u>	
	54			70	

December 20, 1989: 25 schools attended, 16 were absent; February 21, 1990: 28 school attended, 13 were absent; 9 schools were absent from both sessions.

* The asterisks indicate the five high schools participating in CANAL.

representative),¹³ who were expected to communicate the information gathered at the Fair back to their constituencies.

The workshop included an Efficacy Model to emphasize effort rather than innate skills as the key to development. In addition, exhibits exposed participants to demonstrations by computer companies and publishers of software and educational materials.

The principals from the 41 CANAL schools should have attended, but only 21 principals did. Only one school was not represented by a teacher, but only eight schools had students present and, contrary to what might be expected, none of them were from high schools (see Table 10). Twenty-three of the 41 schools had a CPT parent present, while 13 schools had no parent representative. Fifteen schools were not represented by any ancillary staff member (career service representatives are ancillary school staff members). And community members were few: only two schools were so represented.

If there is a surprise in the tabulation of Table 10 it is the small number of teachers on CPTs who participated. Two schools had no teachers present, 23 had one, nine had two, six had three, and only one had as many as four teachers present. The CPT teacher attendance was augmented by 11 non-CPT teachers, who represented only nine of the 41 CANAL schools.

¹³ Ibid.

TABLE 10

Training for 41 CANAL Schools: Instructional Strategies Fair

January 31, 1990

School	Category of Constituent*											
	CPT Attendees						Non-CPT Attendees					
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	Totals	T	S	A	PAR	Totals
Bass		1		1	1		3					
Bennett		2		1	1		4	1		1		2
Bradwell					2		2	1			1	2
Byford		1		1	1		3				2	2
Carter	1	1		1	1		4				1	1
Clark		2			1		3		2		1	3
Cooper	1	3			2	1	7				2	2
DePriest	1	1		2	2		6					
Dett		1			4		5				1	1
DuBois	1	1		1	1		4			1	2	3
Dumas							0					0
DuSable	1	1					2	2				2
Dyett		1					1					0
Fernwood	1	1					2					0
Frazier		2		1	1		4	1		1		2
Gale		2					2					0
Goldblatt	1	1					2				4	4
Gregory	1	1					2		1	3		4
Guggenheim		1		1	1		3				1	1
Hammond		1		2	1		4		1			1
Hearst	1	1					2					0
Howe	1	1			1		3					0
Hughes		1		1	2		4		1			1
Jungman		1		1			2					0
Kelvyn Park	1	2		1			4					0
Lafayette	1	3					4			1	2	3
Lowell	2	1		1			4	2		2	1	5
Manierre	1	1		1	1		4	1			1	2
Mayo		2		1	2		5				1	1
Moos		2					2				1	1
Orr	1	1					2				1	1
Piccolo		3		1	3		7	1			3	4
Robeson		2			2		4				2	2
Sherman	1	3		1	1		6	1				1
Spencer	1	1		1			3	1		1		2

TABLE 10 (Continued)
Training for 41 CANAL Schools: Instructional Strategies Fair
January 31, 1990

School	Category of Constituent*											
	CPT Attendees						Non-CPT Attendees					
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	Totals	T	S	A	PAR	Totals
Stowe		1		1			2	1				1
Sumner	1	2		1			4	1				1
Terrell	1	1		1			3					0
Westinghouse		3		1	1		5					0
Williams	1	3		2	1		7		2	1	3	6
Woodson	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>1</u>
	22	63		27	34	2	148	11	10	11	30	62

*P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. Two LSC/non-CPT members from Hammond and one from Williams also attended the session.

ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE SEMINAR

In keeping with its original proposal, CANAL prepared a special seminar on assertive discipline, which represents one of its key components in terms of the Background Value Systems Model.¹⁴ However, very few schools and even fewer CPT members took advantage of the opportunity to focus on discipline (see Table 11). Only nine schools were represented by the total of 147 attendees. Thirty-one were CPT members; 116 were non-CPT. Most of the attendees came from three schools -- Dett (46), DuBois (32), and Sumner (37). The other six schools were represented by only 32 attendees.

THEMATIC MODELS

A thematic training model was intended to increase awareness and appreciation of multicultural issues in education. Attendance was so very small (see Table 12) that staff discontinued the session. The Ron Edmonds Symposium, offered on December 7 and December 21, presented "teaching and learning about Africa."¹⁵

Paideia Seminars, concerned with train individuals in the Socratic method of instruction, existed prior to CANAL, which made them part of the CANAL training program "in response to School Improvement Plans which indicate a desire to implement the Socratic method of instruction."¹⁶

¹⁴The Model is discussed in the original proposal: Creating a New Approach to Learning, Settlement Fund Proposal, approved April 13, 1988, pp. 8-10.

¹⁵DEEOP CANAL Quarterly Progress Report, February 28, 1990. Chicago Public Schools, p. 18.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 19.

TABLE 11

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
Assertive Discipline Seminar

February 2, 1990

School	CPT	Non-CPT	Total
Bass	2	4	6
Bradwell	2	8	10
Clark		5	5
Dett	4	42	46
DuBois	13	19	32
Fernwood	1	2	3
Gregory		4	4
Sumner	7	30	37
Terrell	2	2	4
	—	—	—
	31	116	147
	Percent Attendees CPT		21.1
	Percent Attendees Non-CPT		78.9

TABLE 12

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
Ron Edmonds Symposium

December 7, 1989, and December 21, 1989

School	CPT and Non-CPT Attending		
	CPT	Non-CPT	Total
Carter		1	1
DePriest		1	1
Dumas		1	1
Dyett	1		1
Gregory	3		3
Sumner	4	1	5
Terrell	3		3
	—	—	—
	11	4	15

The desire to implement the method was not matched by attendance: only nine people from CANAL schools attended the first session, and four of them were not on any CPT of CANAL. An additional five individuals from non-CANAL schools participated. (See Table 14.) The second session was scarcely better attended. Only six CPT members were present, as were another six attendees from non-CANAL schools. It seems difficult to justify use of Settlement Funds to underwrite activities for so few.

SUMMARY

This report is the first systematic effort of the Monitoring Commission to evaluate participation in the special training activities of CANAL. Training for special groups and on special topics are a major component of Project CANAL's training activities. They also consume substantial resources made available through the Settlement Fund. The evidence presented does not demonstrate success by CANAL in attracting individuals to attend the training.

Sessions for chairpersons of high school departments and for school-based evaluators/CPT chairperson/process observers were not well-attended. Sessions for parent liaisons, students, and special groups such as engineers and food services managers were even less well attended. The instructional strategies fair, which should have had broad appeal and for which special groups of representatives were identified at each school, fell short of an attendance that could have been expected. Thematic seminars were so poorly attended that it seems difficult to justify continuing them. Even the two meetings of the CANAL Advisory Council were attended by only a small part of its members.

TABLE 13

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
Paideia Seminar

December 6, 1989

CANAL School Attendees			
Schools	CPT	Non-CPT	Total
Bradwell	1	2	3
Goldblatt		1	1
Mayo	1		1
Woodson	3	1	4
	—	—	—
	5	4	9
Non-CANAL School Attendees			
Austin			1
Carnegie			1
IPR*			2
Wells			1
			—
			5
Total Attendees = 14			

*IPR is the Institute for Philosophical Research

TABLE 14

Training for 41 CANAL Schools
Paideia Seminar

January 10, 1990

CANAL School Attendees			
Schools	CPT	Non-CPT	Total
Bradwell	1		1
Dumas	2		2
Mayo	1		1
Woodson	2		2
	—	—	—
	6	0	6
Non-CANAL School Attendees			
Austin			1
Carnegie			1
IPR*			2
Phillips			1
Wells			1
			—
			6
Total Attendees = 12			

*IPR is the Institute for Philosophical Research

The implementation problems of CANAL, noted in previous reports of the Monitoring Commission, have been confirmed by analyses of the data made available for this report. Project CANAL's earlier failures in constituting the CPTs properly, its inability in addressing the problems subsequently, and its incapacity in attracting members of CANAL school constituencies to training activities provide little reason for optimism.

APPENDICES

35

42

APPENDIX A

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's principal investigator, Dr. Mary E. Davidson, is assisted by primary consultants and full-time Commission staff in monitoring Project CANAL.

Primary consultants are: Joseph E. Hill, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz and Dr. Calvin Smith, Jr. The principal investigator and primary consultants are experienced in various aspects of research.

Staff assigned in whole or in part to monitor Project CANAL are: Barbara S. Anglin, Barb Leebens-Osilaja and Christy R. Spears. Other Commission staff assisting include: Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Complete resumes for the principal investigator, primary consultants and full-time Commission staff appeared in the Commission first quarterly report published in February 1989 and therefore, are not reproduced here. Mr. Hill and Mrs. Anglin's resumes were published in the first quarter, Year 2 progress report published January 1990.

Additional copies of all CANAL monitoring reports published by the Monitoring Commission are available for reference at the Commission's office, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

APPENDIX B
PROJECT CANAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES
AT THE TRAINING CENTER

(March 1, 1990 through June 22, 1990)

CANAL ACTIVITIES AT THE TRAINING CENTER
(March 1, 1990 through June 22, 1990)

March 1990

03/01/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Howe)*
03/02/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Howe)*
03/06/90	Total Site Training (DuBois)
03/07/90	Cadre Training
03/07/90	CPT Training (Robeson)*
03/07/90	High School Principals Workshop
03/07/90	Paideia Seminar
03/08/90	Total Site Training (Bradwell)*
03/08/90	Elementary Principals' Workshop*
03/09/90	Total Site Training (Sherman)
03/12/90	Total Site Training (Dett)*
03/13/90	Total Site Training (Goldblatt)*
03/14/90	Total Site Training (Byford)*
03/15/90	Total Site Training (Hearst)*
03/16/90	School-based Evaluators, CPT chairs, and Process Observers
03/16/90	Instructional Cadre Training
03/19/90	Total Site Training (Piccolo)*
03/20/90	Total Site Training (Piccolo)
03/20/90	Parent Liaisons Workshop
03/21/90	High School Chairpersons Meeting
03/22/90	Total Site Training (Hammond)
03/23/90	Total Site Training (Gale)
03/26/90	Total Site Training (Lowell)
03/27/90	Total Site Training (Lowell)*
03/28/90	Total Site Training (Sumner)*
03/29/90	Total Site Training (Gregory)*
03/30/90	Total Site Training (Cooper)*

April 1990

04/02/90	Total Site Training (Stowe)
04/03/90	Total Site Training (Stowe)
04/04/90	Total Site Training (Jungman)*
04/04/90	High School Principals' Workshop
04/04/90	Paideia
04/05/90	Total Site Training (Moos)
04/05/90	Elementary Principals' Workshop
04/06/90	CPT Representatives and LSC Chairpersons Workshop
04/10/90	Total Site Training (Carter)*

CANAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES (Continued)

April 1990

04/11/90	Total Site Training (Hughes)*
04/11/90	Student Workshop*
04/12/90	School-based Evaluators, CPT chairs, and Process Observers*
04/16/90	Local School Council Training*
04/17/90	Parent Liaisons' Workshop
04/17/90	Local School Council Training*
04/18/90	Instructional Cadre Training*
04/19/90	Instructional Cadre Training
04/19/90	Advisory Council Meeting
04/20/90	Total Site Training (Dumas/CPC)
04/30/90	Instructional Cadre Training*

May 1990

05/02/90	High School Principals' Workshop
05/02/90	Paideia Seminar
05/03/90	Total Site Training (Terrell)*
05/03/90	Elementary Principals' Workshop
05/04/90	School-based Evaluators, CPT chairs, and Process Observers
05/07/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Williams)*
05/07/90	Local School Council Training
05/08/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Williams)*
05/09/90	Total Site Training (Guggenheim)
05/10/90	Total Site Training (Dyett)
05/10/90	Local School Council Training
05/11/90	Total Site Training (Bass)*
05/11/90	Local School Council Training
05/14/90	Total Site Training (DePriest)
05/14/90	Total Site Training (Orr English Department)
05/14/90	Local School Council Training
05/15/90	Total Site Training (Frazier)
05/15/90	Parent Liaisons Workshop
05/16/90	High School Chairpersons Workshop
05/17/90	Total Site Training (Fernwood)
05/17/90	Local School Council Training
05/18/90	CPT Workshop (DuSable, Westinghouse, Orr, Robeson, and Kelyvn Park)
05/18/90	Local School Council Training
05/21/90	Total Site Training (Clark)*
05/21/90	Local School Council Training

CANAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES (Continued)

May 1990

05/22/90	Total Site Training (Woodson North)*
05/23/90	CPT Workshop (Bass, Dumas, Carter, Hughes, Manierre/Ferguson, Spencer and Williams)*
05/24/90	CPT Workshop (Bradwell, Byford, Dett, DuBois, Gregory, Manierre and Sherman)
05/24/90	Advisory Council Meeting
05/25/90	Local School Council Training
05/25/90	Local School Council Training
05/25/90	CPT Workshop (Cooper, Gregory, Jungman, Lafayette, Moos and Stowe)*
05/29/90	Total Site Training (Kelvyn Park)*
05/30/90	Total Site-Training (Kelvyn Park)
05/31/90	Total Site Training (Orr High School)*
05/31/90	Local School Council Training

June 1990

06/01/90	Total Site Training (Mayo)
06/01/90	Staff Development Design Team Meeting (Orr High School)
06/04/90	Core Planning Team Workshop (Piccolo, Lowell, Luis Munoz Marin Primary, Hearst and Sumner)*
06/04/90	Local School Council Meeting
06/05/90	CPT Workshop (Clark, Frazier, Bennett/Shedd, Fernwood and DePriest)*
06/06/90	CPT Workshop (Dyett, Howe, Guggenheim, Terrell and Woodson North)
06/07/90	Total Site Training (Westinghouse High School)*
06/08/90	Workshop for: Principals, School-based Evaluators, CPT chairs, Process Observers, Parent Liaisons, Local School Council chairs and Students)
06/11/90	Total Site Training (Bass)
06/12/90	Total Site Training (DuSable High School)*
06/13/90	Total Site Training (DuSable High School)
06/18/90	Instructional Cadre Training*
06/20/90	Instructional Cadre Training
06/21/90	Instructional Cadre Training
06/22/90	Instructional Cadre Training

* Activities monitored by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

APPENDIX C
BUDGET STATUS

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

PROJECT CANAL

SECOND YEAR

<u>OPERATING EXPENSES</u>	<u>Second Year Budget</u>	<u>Modifi cation</u>	<u>Revised Yr Budget</u>	<u>Encumbrances/ Expenses 06/30/90</u>	<u>Balance As of 06/90</u>
Supplies	\$ 3,300	\$ 0	\$ 3,300	\$ 2,555	\$ 745
Postage	5,000	0	5,000	1,994	3,006
Consultant Services	127,000	0	127,000	126,039	961
Printing	5,000	0	5,000	4,121	879
Travel	20,000	10,000	30,000	14,995	15,005
Furniture/Equipment	14,000	(10,000)	4,000	2,396	1,604
<u>Total Operating Expenses</u>	<u>\$174,300</u>	<u>\$ -0-</u>	<u>\$174,300</u>	<u>\$152,100</u>	<u>\$22,200</u>

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

PROJECT CANAL

Second Year Budget Detail as of 06/30/90

General Office Supplies	\$ 2,555
-------------------------	----------

Postage	1,994
---------	-------

Consultant Services as of 06/30/90:

Expended	\$106,956
Encumbered	<u>19,083</u>

Total Expenditures/Encumbrances	126,039
---------------------------------	---------

Printing:

Stationery	\$ 83
Mailing Labels	990
Flyers	308
Project CANAL Reports	<u>2,740</u>

Total Printing	4,121
----------------	-------

Travel Expenses:

Hotel	\$ 6,397
Auto Mileage	124
Food	1,533
Airfare	5,329
Local	1,206
Miscellaneous	<u>406</u>

Total Travel	15,035
--------------	--------

Furniture/Equipment:

Typewriter	\$ 687
File Cabinets	956
Dictaphone	324
Service Contract	<u>429</u>

Total Furniture/Equipment	<u>2,396</u>
---------------------------	--------------

Total Operating Expenses	<u>\$ 152,100</u>
--------------------------	-------------------

APPENDIX D
BOARD RESOLUTION ON PROJECT CANAL

March 21, 1990

ACCEPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE
TO THE COMMITTEE ON DESEGREGATION
CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION

THE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT RECOMMENDS:

accept the attached Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Task Force to the Committee on Desegregation.

DESCRIPTION:

Generally, the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Task Force are in accordance with the proposal, Creating a New Approach to Learning (Project CANAL), prepared by the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs in response to the Settlement Agreement between the United States of America and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. It should be noted that the Core Planning Team will continue to report to the Local School Council with the clear understanding that the Local School Council is the authority at the local school and that staff development for both the Local School Council and the Core Planning Team will continue.

FINANCIAL:

No additional cost to the Board of Education.

Respectfully Submitted,



Ted D. Kimbrough
General Superintendent of Schools

March 21, 1990

an Elementary School Teacher assigned to Hope Community Academy, 5515 South Lowe Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60621, Subdistrict 8 and he hereby requests the dismissal of Armand Haeger from the employ of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago.

That Armand Haeger shall be dismissed from the employ of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago following adoption of this Board Report, the accompanying charges and specifications, and service thereof upon Armand Haeger, unless a request for hearing on such charge is made by him within 10 days following such service.

That Armand Haeger has been afforded a pre-suspension hearing and that he intends to suspend Armand Haeger from the service without pay effective immediately upon service on Armand Haeger of notice of suspension and impending dismissal together with a copy of this Board Report and the accompanying charges and specifications.

FINDING:

The Board of Education of the City of Chicago finds that since Armand Haeger has failed to complete a remediation plan with a satisfactory or better rating, it is deemed that his unsatisfactory teaching performance has become irremediable and constitutes grounds for dismissal. The Board of Education also finds that the conduct underlying the conduct unbecoming a teacher charge is irremediable.

90-0321-MS4

**ACCEPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE TO THE
COMMITTEE ON DESEGREGATION - CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION**

THE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT RECOMMENDS:

Accept the attached recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Task Force to the Committee on Desegregation.

DESCRIPTION:

Generally, the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Task Force are in accordance with the proposal, Creating a New Approach to Learning (Project CANAL), prepared by the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs in response to the Settlement Agreement between the United States of America and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. It should be noted that the Core Planning Team will continue to report to the Local School Council with the clear understanding that the Local School Council is the authority at the local school and that staff development for both the Local School Council and the Core Planning Team will continue.

FINANCIAL:

No additional cost to the Board of Education.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE
TO THE COMMITTEE ON DESEGREGATION CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**CREATING A NEW APPROACH TO LEARNING: A STRATEGY FOR
ACCELERATING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH SCHOOL REFORM**

The advent of school reform in the Chicago Public Schools opens new horizons for improving the academic achievement of all students by enhancing the potential for achieving the original goal of the Settlement Fund Proposal. This goal is to have a minimum of 50 percent of

the participating students in each school perform at or above grade level in reading and mathematics as evidenced by scores on standardized achievement tests and will demonstrate increased achievement in other content areas. The Settlement Fund Proposal although conceived prior to the adoption of school reform is compatible with the goals of reform. In order to facilitate congruence between the goals of school reform and the Settlement Fund Proposal it is recommended that the Board of Education refocus and modify Project CANAL to take into account that the Local School Council members are the leaders for local school planning. In addition, the intent is to emphasize content and not just the process of decision making and thus improve the content and effectiveness of School Improvement Plans mandated by P.A. 85-1418. The proposed modifications include the following program initiatives:

- (a) continued training in school based management and shared governance;
- (b) knowledge about curriculum foci that facilitate academic achievement;
- (c) knowledge about the total allocation of resources to the local school to allow for comprehensive planning and budgeting at the level of the local school; and
- (d) an evaluation plan that addresses both the process of implementing the foregoing initiatives as well as their impact on the academic achievement of participating students.

The recommended modifications are designed to revise and strengthen the activities of CANAL.

Purpose

The purpose is to combine the authority and organizational framework of school reform with the resources of the Settlement Fund Proposal to provide training for comprehensive programming in local school planning beginning with the 41 schools currently being served by CANAL. By comprehensive programming is meant a set of coordinated activities organized around a theoretical framework (e.g. learning theory, instructional theory, developmental theory, a management approach, etc.) with constituent elements that include staff development, a support system, resources including community resources, and an evaluation design.

Objectives

I. Recognize that the Local School Council mandated by school reform will provide the organizational context for school based management:

the members of the Local School Council are the vehicles for developing and implementing school-based management at the local school level; and

the Local School Council may be complemented with representatives of key constituencies of the local school system to form a planning team that enhances meeting the requirements of school-based management (e.g. Professional Personnel Advisory Committee, ESEA Chapter I, bilingual, special education, etc.)

March 21, 1990

II. Focus training activities on the content of planning and decision-making for eliminating barriers to academic achievement at the level of the local school beginning with the 41 schools presently participating in CANAL and continuing to additional schools as they are:

training will address needs on two levels: those of providing members of the Local School Council planning teams, with the skills and knowledge needed to exercise their responsibilities; and, those that are aimed directly at resolving problems that interfere with academic achievement;

Settlement Funds will be used to provide professional assistance and training to Local School Council planning teams on options about curriculum to enable them to better participate in the selection of curriculum and program strategies;

Settlement Funds will be used to provide information on foundation knowledge needed to plan and develop programs within the local schools directly related to academic achievement; and

Settlement Funds will be used to provide Local School Council planning teams with skill training and basic knowledge about program initiatives for the short term (one year) and the long term (three years).

III. Focus activities to provide a new perspective on the total pool of resources available to the local school to enhance program and budget planning:

Settlement Funds will be used to provide support for assessing and evaluating the total pool of resources available to the local school to maximize appropriate allocational decisions to support student achievement;

Settlement Funds will be used to provide support for assessing all program initiatives in place at the local school;

the Local School Council planning team will have access to advice and information regarding budget allocations from appropriate administrative professionals of the Chicago Public Schools; and

the Local School Council planning teams may propose alternate locations of the total pool of resources available to their local school in order to address academic achievement through a comprehensive program strategy.

IV. Modify the Settlement Fund Proposal to include an evaluation strategy for assessing all organizational structures, curriculum and program strategies, models for resource allocation and their outcomes, emphasizing evaluation strategies that allow for the replication of successful initiatives

Settlement Funds will be used to support evaluations that are timely in terms of implementations needs at the local level, that provide an overall assessment of program outcomes, and that provide information necessary for replicating successful initiatives;

March 21, 1990

the evaluation strategy will include a calendar of periodic reviews to assure appropriate implementation and to monitor progress towards improving academic achievement; and

the evaluation will provide timely reports and responses to DEEOP, the Chicago Public Schools, the Board of Education and the Monitoring Commission.

V. The modification of Project CANAL to emphasize accelerating academic achievement through school reform will be inaugurated with a planning period to allow for thoughtful and purposive action.

the planning period will be used to develop strategies for meeting organizational exigencies and assess initial plans and programs; and

the period will be used to allow for review and comment by relevant parties to the Settlement.

APPENDIX E
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROJECT CANAL

51

58

PROJECT CANAL HEARING SYNOPSIS

MARCH 9, 1990

For Submission to the Chicago Board of Education's
Desegregation Committee

By the

BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE

Dr. Mary E. Davidson
Mr. Joseph E. Hill, Consultant
Dr. Gwendolyn Laroche
Mrs. Diana G. Lauber
Mr. David Luna

Prepared by Christy R. Spears

March 15, 1990

Prepared for the Board of Education Committee on Desegregation

March 15, 1990

BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE

PROJECT CANAL HEARING

Task Force Members

Dr. Mary E. Davidson, Chairperson

Mr. Joseph E. Hill, Consultant

Dr. Gwendolyn Laroche

Mrs. Diana G. Lauber

Mr. David Luna

MARCH 9, 1990

Presenting initial remarks and the purpose of the hearing, Mary E. Davidson, chairperson of the Blue Ribbon Task Force and Joseph E. Hill, Task Force consultant, briefly stated that the Task Force provided recommendations to the Committee on Desegregation regarding changes that could make the desegregation programs more effective in terms of carrying out the goals of the Consent Decree. At no time, Mr. Hill noted, has there been any discussion with doing away with Project CANAL. The concept of Project CANAL is considered excellent; however, the new reality of school reform and the legislated authority of the local school councils (LSCs) creates a different environment for Project CANAL. In light of this change, the Blue Ribbon Task Force sought to make recommendations to bring Project CANAL into agreement and to improve implementation.

Task Force members responded to some specific questions. Dr. Davidson told the participants that the LSC training at Project CANAL Training Center was halted because

of her concerns about the lack of a comprehensive strategy to provide the training on an ongoing basis as needed, rather than for one time only. She emphasized the research and demonstration thrust of CANAL and the need for training modules to be replicable and for portability of successful models of local school initiatives rather than for one time. She also noted, in response to a speaker's comments, that the Task Force is committed to the 41 schools and their fiscal support, saying she believes the number should be capped at 80 schools. The Task Force also is committed to bringing in additional schools to the Project, but not at the expense of the original 41 schools.

Task Force member Diana G. Lauber refuted a speaker's contention that the law mandated 30 hours of training. While the law does mandate training, it does not specify 30 hours. The 30 hours referred to is the measure stating that the Board of Education will not pay for more than 30 hours of training should the school want the Board to fund training.

The Task Force appreciated the comments of Lafayette Ford, chairperson of the School Board Nominating Commission, who noted that the Commission is concerned about prospective Board members' sensitivity to the problems that exist within the school system.

Parents, community people, teachers and principals were among the concerned persons who shared their views on Project CANAL in the participating schools. The following information reflects the prevailing themes and concerns that surfaced during the course of this discussion. These remarks noted below do not reflect the view of the Task Force. While it is the best attempt at summarizing the comments of the various speakers, the Blue Ribbon Task Force assumes responsibility for errors of omission, fact or interpretation.

Of the 41 Project CANAL schools, 21 were represented. They are:

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Bennett-Shedd | 2. Bradwell |
| 3. Carter | 4. Clark |
| 5. DePriest | 6. Dumas |
| 7. Dyett | 8. Gale |
| 9. Gregory | 10. Hughes |
| 11. Manierre | 12. Mayo |
| 13. Orr H.S. | 14. Robeson H.S. |
| 15. Sherman | 16. Spencer |
| 17. Sumner | 18. Terrell |
| 19. Westinghouse H.S. | 20. Williams |
| 21. Woodson North | |

I. LSC INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT CANAL

A. LSC Dominance

Many persons expressed concern about the local school council becoming overly involved in Project CANAL to the point where it can change previously agreed upon Project CANAL school plans. One participant adamantly disapproved of the local school councils (LSCs) dominating the process in Project CANAL. Despite the fact that they are legislated bodies, this person argued that the LSCs nor the school reform legislation supersede the Consent Decree. He insisted that "the LSCs should not be included in the process unless they are first properly trained." The speaker noted the current needs of the LSCs, noting that "the LSCs lack a great deal. The dangers intensify if LSCs are allowed to control Project CANAL, without an understanding of the project, the federal decree responsible for its implementation and the federal dollars support it." The speaker encouraged the Task Force and the Committee on Desegregation not to damage CANAL by including schools that do not qualify.

B. Additional Burdens for LSCs

One speaker viewed the Task Force's insistence of LSC involvement as an increased burden to the LSC members at his respective school--persons who work full-time and who are also heavily involved in the local school council.

C. LSCs and CPTs: Cooperative Working Relationships

Several speakers contend that the two groups, the LSC and the core planning team (CPT), work together cooperatively because, in many cases, people belong to both bodies. The speakers, confused by the Task Force's suggestion of including the LSCs and

helping them to become more involved, insisted that the LSCs and core planning teams have been working together for awhile. At many schools, the core planning teams function as "subcommittees", sending measures to the LSC for approval.

One speaker noted that Project CANAL's core planning team (CPT) has not usurped the LSC's power. He recalled that the core planning team at his school was instrumental in finding parents and community representatives to run for the local school council elections. During the election, the core planning team served as election facilitators, explaining and helping people understand the school reform law. Since the elections, the core planning team has met to further develop its school improvement plan, going to the LSC to receive direction and approval.

Another speaker noted that his school's LSC signs off on everything emanating from the core planning team. He asserted that everything meshes at the school.

The "backbone of school reform" is the way one speaker viewed Project CANAL. As LSC chairperson, he informed the Task Force of the amiable working relationship of the LSC and CPT and how the LSC readily adopted the school's CANAL school improvement plan. Design teams representing various aspects of the plan report to the local school council on a regular basis.

Several speakers noted the comraderie that exist between members of the LSC and the CPT. A speaker recalled, prior to the LSC elections, the core planning team used CANAL funds and supplied LSC candidates with paper to print flyers and facilitated meetings where LSC candidates addressed various school and educational concerns. Following the elections, the newly elected LSC members were welcomed to join the core

planning team and were given information regarding CANAL. They also were encouraged to provide suggestions.

At another school, the speaker indicated that over 600 school and community people attended a ceremony introducing and welcoming LSC members. The newly elected LSC members also were given a synopsis of the school improvement plan. One speaker pointed out that the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation "will not be able to elicit these kinds of data merely by looking at the facts and figures." Several speakers encouraged the Monitoring Commission to visit the schools and not just the training center.

Several speakers attributed the cooperative spirit between the two groups to the training they received at Project CANAL's Training Center (i.e. brainstorming, consensus building). A Parent Social, sponsored by the school's Project CANAL Core Planning Team, was held for the local school council. The speaker is convinced that the LSC could not have done it without CANAL.

II. PROJECT CANAL'S SUCCESS AND EFFECTIVENESS

A. Schools' Innovative Projects and Activities

Project CANAL was described as a diverse and successful program with innovative projects and activities at their respective schools. Speakers described a parent room, a student writing lab and a school/community retreat at the Indian Lakes Resort. They emphasized that those activities have helped to develop and enhance communication and achievement.

B. School Reform Training

Project CANAL was described, by one speaker, as being "light years down the road" in terms of citywide educational reform. Suggested that Project CANAL's Training Center become the focus of local school education and preparation because the key to success is proper parent and community preparation.

A teacher said that Project CANAL's success lies in shared decision-making, its efforts to bring all concerned parties together to make decisions. He indicated that Project CANAL "far exceeds any other attempts to help local communities to develop a school" and one that they can have pride in and adequately serve the children. Without Project CANAL, this speaker estimated that his school would be where many schools are today: without vision, direction or purpose.

C. Enhancing Instructional Programs

Project CANAL, according to one speaker, has been particularly helpful in improving the instructional program at his school. Even if it emerged accidentally, the cadre of substitute teachers have been adequately trained to properly operate the school in the absence of the regular faculty. He emphasized that the school's internal commitment to CANAL is what makes it a success.

D. Positive Attitude Changes

Many speakers attributed the positive changes in parental attitudes and the increase in parental involvement to Project CANAL. The students' improved attitudes toward educational achievements and teachers' improved expectations of their students.

E. Parental Training and Involvement

Project CANAL has been instrumental in training parents to assess the tests that are administered to their children by the teachers. This speaker stated that CANAL staff help parents review tests and then assist them in helping the teachers determine the progress of the children using grid sheets and to assess which areas children require additional assistance.

F. Technical Training

Project CANAL, according to some speakers, has provided the schools with immense technical assistance, teaching them to facilitate workshops, to write proposals, to evaluate proposals, to acquire educational knowledge through various resources and to secure competent workshop consultants.

III. EXCLUSION OF COMMUNITY PEOPLE AND PARENTS FROM THE BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE AND ITS DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

A. Parent and Community Input

One participant noted the worth of the Task Force's ideas, but lamented over the Task Force's exclusion of parents and community people. Referring to the Illinois School Reform Law, P.A. 85-1418, the law requires diverse representation in all aspects of educational decision-making. The participant encouraged the Task Force to include the Project CANAL schools in the original discussions, the initial deliberations that occur prior to the final decisions. Now that decisions have been made, it only allows people an opportunity to react. Constructive criticisms are more appreciated, the participant noted, before decisions are made, rather than after they are made. The Task Force was encouraged

to make unannounced visits to the schools to determine whether or not Project CANAL is working. The participant insisted that school observations, rather than paper documentation, provide more effective evaluations.

B. Training for LSCs

A few speakers stated that the termination of the CANAL training in December sent mixed and confusing signals regarding the future of the Project. Several speakers questioned Task Force members regarding the reinstatement of this training. Chairperson Dr. Davidson informed participants that the LSC training was halted because there was no comprehensive strategy for providing LSC training on an ongoing basis. She emphasized the research and demonstration thrust of CANAL and the need for training modules to be replicable and for portability of successful models of local school initiatives rather than for one time.

The terminated training issue resurfaced again as a principal accused the Task Force of stifling the Project CANAL's staff efforts to provide the schools with the state-mandated 30 hours of training. By canceling the training, the speaker further contended that the Task Force is "robbing the local school councils of the opportunity to become as versed as they want to be and should be to operate within the parameters defined by law. . . . That is an obstruction of reform."

Mrs. Lauber refuted the speaker's contention about the law mandating 30 hours of training. She stated that there is nothing in the law that mandates 30 hours of training. The law does mandate training; however, the 30 hours referred to is the measure stating that the Board of Education will not pay for more than 30 hours of training should the school

want the Board to fund training. Despite her comments, the speaker insisted that the information coming from the Board speaks of 30 hours.

IV. CONCERNS AND SKEPTICISM REGARDING THE BACKGROUND AND INTENT OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS

One speaker discussed the importance of the perceptual screens and backgrounds that people bring into various situations. Aware of the backgrounds that he and other school/community people bring to this educational situation, he indicated that he is "paranoid" about the backgrounds of the Task Force members and the perceptual screens from which they are looking at this event.

A teacher who spoke during the hearing cautioned the Task Force about reverting back to the days when programs were originated and implemented based solely on the input and ideas of central office staff; these programs eventually failed. This teacher commented that he and his coworkers fear that Project CANAL is heading down that same road of failure, despite the commitments and efforts.

Several speakers revealed their disapproval of being questioned and scrutinized by the Board, the Monitoring Commission and the Blue Ribbon Task Force. Others considered the Task Force's recommendation for changes in Project CANAL as premature. Contending that the group's "timing is off", they contended that now is not the time to adversely change a project that has been successful and effective in many school settings. Dr. Davidson, Task Force chairperson, again underscored the obvious success in some schools, but once again discussed the gap between those successes and data in support of replication, since the CANAL dollars are one-time dollars.

Suggesting that Task Force "practice what they preach", one speaker noted that the task force's handout, "Creating A New Approach to Learning: A Strategy for Accelerating Academic Achievement Through School Reform" does not include the input of any CANAL participants who would be affected by these decisions.

**V. CONCERNS ABOUT OTHER SCHOOLS ENTERING THE PROCESS
AND DILUTING THE EFFORTS OF CURRENT CANAL SCHOOLS**

During the course of the hearing, several speakers expressed concern about non-Project CANAL schools jeopardizing the funds of the Project at the participating schools--schools that joined CANAL in an effort to "proactively search for ways to improve student achievement." Dr. Davidson, in response to the speaker's comments, emphasized that the Task Force is committed to the 41 schools and their fiscal support, saying she believes the number should be capped at 80 schools. The Task Force also is committed to bringing in additional schools to the Project, however, not at the expense of the original 41 schools. Other speakers shared their worries about Project CANAL funds becoming diluted during the five-year period to allow for inclusion of the proposed additional 110 schools and/or distribution of the limited funds to all of the city's 600 schools.

**VI. PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS' ABILITY TO SUSTAIN GOALS AND ACTIVITIES
ONCE THE FUNDS HAVE BEEN DEPLETED**

Speakers addressing this issue are certain that they have adequate people and activities in place to sustain the project at their respective schools. A few suggested the continued use of fund raising programs, the continued usage of parent cadres and the

renewal of business and community partnerships.

One principal said that Project CANAL's technical training in proposal writing and planning has enabled the core planning team to develop plans and to set those plans in motion prior to the termination of Project CANAL's five-year funding.

VII. SCHOOL DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED DURING THE HEARING

A. Hans Christian Andersen School: Gregory Cephaus, a Quantum Education Institute representative and an LSC member, submitted a concept analysis and recommendations of the Task Force's draft version of "Creating A New Approach to Learning: Center for Accelerating Academic Achievement Through School Reform (this version was never presented for public review)." Mr. Cephaus, in this document, specifically questions the conceptual framework of the task force report. He contends that:

Specific operational mechanisms are indeed needed to accelerate academic achievement under school reform. These mechanisms must be established and systematically developed. The school reform law (P.A. 85-1418) does not reflect any research and development basis or set of principles and techniques to provide such support (p.2).

The report includes several recommendations. One specifically proposes that:

School-based Development and Management Science Manuals be developed in collaboration with local schools and Local School Councils for each of the racially isolated and racially-identifiable schools (p. 2).

In addition, the report suggests that the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (DEEOP) "... be restructured and developed around fundamentally sound management, project management, operations development, and administrative

principles." Despite the vital roles of these component areas, the report notes that they "are not properly implemented in the department." To rectify this situation, Mr. Cephaus proposed "staff retraining, additions and deletions (p. 3)."

B. Frank Bennett-Shedd School: Representatives of Bennett-Shedd's LSC submitted a copy of a letter sent to Board of Education President James W. Compton. The letter describes the school community's positive feelings about Project CANAL and highlights the benefits of the Project.

C. Michele Clark School: The "Clark Flyer," a school newsletter includes brief stories about student, staff and community goals and accomplishments. "CANAL Fact Sheet for Parents," informs parents about the use of Project CANAL funds at Michele Clark.

D. Jean Baptiste Point DuSable High School: Although representatives from DuSable High School did not speak during the hearing, a synopsis of the school's Project CANAL activities was submitted. This report highlights the Project's benefits for students, staff, parents and community people.

E. Alexander Dumas School: This document discusses the school, staff, student, parent and community benefits emerging from Project CANAL.

F. Rezin Orr Community Academy High School: Representatives of Orr submitted the school's outline of its 1988-89 school improvement plan and five issues of the school's newsletter, "Orr Community Academy News: 'Keeping Parents and the Community Informed.'" The newsletters feature information about the LSC officers, parental views about Project CANAL and community activities sponsored by the school.

G. Charles Sumner School: Representatives of Sumner presented a copy of a letter sent to Board President James W. Compton outlining the school community's concerns about Board decisions affecting the continuation of Project CANAL. An additional document highlights the school programs specifically funded by Project CANAL (English and Spanish versions).

H. Mary Church Terrell School: The school representative submitted documents reflecting the Terrell School's active involvement in Project CANAL.

SPEAKERS BY 21 PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS

BENNETT-SHEDD

Val Jordan
LSC Community Representative

BRADWELL

Gwendolyn Mingo
LSC President

Linda Sneed
Parent

CARTER

Kim Hunter
LSC Secretary, CPT Member

Stephanie Lee
Volunteer Parent

MICHELE CLARK

James Deanes
LSC Representative

DEPRIEST

Drucilla Buchannan
Parent Volunteer

DYETT

Carolyn Vessel
LSC President

DUMAS

Peggy Bartlett
LSC President

GALE

Edis Snyder
Principal

GREGORY

Rev. Floyd James
LSC President

Theotus Leonard
Assistant Principal

HUGHES

Harold London
Principal

MANIERRE

Regina Stewart
CANAL Parent Liaison

MAYO

Otha Henderson
CPT Member

ORR H.S.

Nancy Apke
Teacher

ROBESON H.S.

Annie Holmes
CPT Chairperson

SPEAKERS BY PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS
(continued)

SHERMAN

John Beck
LSC President

SPENCER

Patricia Wilburn
Parent Volunteer

SUMNER

Deloris Robinson
CPT Chairperson

TERRELL

Doris Jennings
Parent Volunteer

WESTINGHOUSE H.S.

Frank Candio
Interim Principal

WILLIAMS

Leslie Brown
Teacher Facilitator

WOODSON NORTH

William Taylor
Principal

TWO NON-PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS

ANDERSEN

Gregory Cephaus
LSC Member

SCANLAN

Larry Nolan
LSC President